ARYA SAMAJ
MYTH AND REALITY

(Ch. 14 of '*Storm in Punjab*')

Kshitish Vedalankar

1985

The Word Publications
New Delhi

PDF created by Rajesh Arya - Gujarat

© 1984 Kshitish Vedalankar

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, or by any information storage/retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Rs. 120 .

First Publication : September 1984 (Hindi)
Second Publication : December 1984 (Hindi)
First Publication : October 1985 (English)

English rendition by
Vinod Dhawan

Published by : The Word Publications
807/95 Nehru Place, New Delhi-110019 Tel. 6410454

14 Arya Samaj: Myth and the Reality

MOST Sikh historians persistently accuse the Arya Samaj of 'drawing a wedge between Hindus and Sikhs. Sikh leaders keep saying that their religious and political demands are not opposed by Muslims and Christians. Even the majority of Hindus, according to them, are not opposed to the demands. But Arya Samaj intellectuals and journalists lose no time in starting an agitation and succeed in influencing the Government against the Sikh demands which are thus promptly rejected. Indeed a Sikh journal published in English, has gone to the extent of saying that anything published against the Akali demands or their agitation in any paper in any language, and in any part of the country, can safely be attributed to an Arya Samaj writer, or to one who has beeb influenced by Arya Samaj thinking. Dr Mahip Singh had written in Dharmayug: "Before the advent of Arya Samaj it was the Sikh thinking which created a new awakening among the Hindus of Punjab, and Sikhs and Sanatani Hindus had worked in unison." However it is an illusion created by some Sikh intellectuals leading to a fresh false notion in current politics. Well-known journalist Khushwant Singh had once said: "Because of reformist, unorthodox and progressive views, Sikhs and Arya Samajis should have been the closest to each other, but I am amazed that today they are poles apart."

We will have to find out the reasons for, and the source of, this cleavage. For, until this mental approach is removed, this cleavage and the consequent illfeeling will persist, and that will in no case be to the good of Punjab. Here it becomes necessary to look at a bit of history.

Before Arya Samaj

Swami Dayanand had founded the Arya Samaj in 1875. He passed away in 1883. "Satyartha Prakash" was first published in

1875. Therefore it would be wholly unjust to blame the Arya Samaj or Swami Dayanand for events that may have occured before that date.

It will be relevant to recall an episode during Akbar's reign in the 16th century. The Emperor once sent Raja Birbal, his trusted adviser, on an expedition to liquidate the Pathans of Yusufzai. In accordance with the royal command, as he was on his way to accomplish the mission, Birbal imposed a levy of rupee one on every Hindu, and tried to realize the tax at Amritsar. The local Khatris, who were followers of Guru Arjun Dev, and Guru himself told Birbal's officers in clear terms:

> As a community we are separate from the Hindus. The tax should not be imposed on us."

Raja Birbal however rejected their plea. ('A History of Sikh People' by Gopal Singh — pp. 177)

On page 312 of Harbans Singh Doabia's "Sacred Nit Name", one finds the following among the tenets prescribed for the Sikh sect:

A. Don't worship idols, pictures, graves and dead persons.
B. Don't worship gods and goddesses.
C. Don't tread the path of yoga and penance.

Then in 1712, one of the *Guru's* well-known devotees, Bhai Nandlal, said this in a couplet in "Tankhaha Nama":

> "*Raj Karega Khalsa Aaki rahe na koy.*
> *Khwar hoye sab milenge Bachay saran jo hoy.*"

Isn't the slogan "*Raj karega Khalsa*" a proof of something that stood against unity?

Such examples can be multiplied. It is thus clear that the seeds of separation were not sown by Arya Samaj. Separatism had existed in Sikh thinking long before Arya Samaj was born.

It is equally true that this kind of separatist tendency did not last long. Hindus and Sikhs have all along functioned as two wings of the same society. However, when the British established their supremacy over Punjab in 1849, there was a change in the situation. First, they annihilated the Sikhs. Later, when they needed help in quelling the rebellion of 1857, they encouraged Sikh separatism. It should be remembered in this context that in 1855, when India's first census was held, Sikhs were counted not as a separate community but as part of the Hindu fold.

An Englishman, Steinbeck, who had served Maharajá Ranjit Singh between 1809 and 1839, has said in his memoirs that he had seen *Amritdhari* Sikhs only as part of the strong "iron-chain" of nationalism. It has already been stated in chapter eight how the British broke this "iron-chain", won the Sikhs on their side and succeeded in suppressing the Mutiny.

Singh Sabha and Khalsa Dewan

Guru Singh Sabha was established in 1873, i.e. a couple of years before Arya Samaj came into being. And this Sabha had the blessings of the British. That is why the aims and objects of the Sabha included a stipulation that it would not indulge in any anti-Government activity. Also, while English officials were permitted to join this organisation, no Hindu could do so! The journals, tracts and booklets which the Singh Sabha published—and their number was not small—carried the announcement that the Sabha's ideal was to work for "God, Guru and Government". To work for the "Crown, Country and Community" (the Sikh community) was the motto of "the Sikh Sipahi". All these publications laid stress only on the (supposed) separateness of Hindus and Sikhs. The attempt was to prove that the Sikh gurus never propagated Hindu ideals and customs; nor the Vedic philosophy or Hindu epics.

Even the sphere of education was not spared. The Singh Sabha introduced the spirit of separateness in this field also. In the farewell address to Lord Ripon on 13 November, 1884, the Khalsa Dewan demanded a separate college for the Sikhs. It was in fact specifically mentioned in the address that the Singh Sabha did not consider Sikhs a part of Hindu society. Dr Ganda Singh himself has said that "Khalsa Dewan people were, from time to time, telling the provincial governors, the governor-General and Queen Victoria through representations that the Sikh *Panth* was not a part of Hindu society and that the Sikhs should be treated as a separate group, which is particularly in need of help in the field of education."

It is known that many English officials made donations for the establishment of Khalsa College. Its first principal was an Englishman, the president of its council was the Commissioner of Lahore, also an Englishman, while another Englishman, the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar, became Director of the College. And Khalsa College played the same role in generating the feeling of separatism among the Sikhs, which the Aligarh Muslim University did in the case of Muslim separatism. India's first President Dr Rajendra Prasad, has clearly said in his book 'India Divided' that Aligarh Muslim University had played a significant part in the creation of Pakistan.

It was the Singh Sabha which for the first time trained propaganda squads which succeeded in converting a large number of Hindus to Sikhism in northern Punjab, Sind and urban Hindus in many parts of Punjab. Among the principal preachers on behalf of the Singh Sabha were Sahib Singh Vedi, Kahan Singh Vedi, Atar Singh and Sangat

Singh. It was the Singh Sabha which produced writers like Bir Singh, Deet Singh and Macauliffe who put anti-Hindu interpretations to Gurus' teachings.

The British Secretary of State for India had entrusted Dr Emest Trumpp of Munich with the task of translating the 'Granth Sahib' into English. And, Dr Trumpp has said in his preface to the book that "in the role of family priests, the prestige and importance of *Brahmins* had not been minimised. Almost all the Gurus had their family priests, although at times the principles laid down in Vedas and Puranas and their teachings had been criticised too." The same Dr Trumpp, writes:

> "In accordance with the sum total of his views, Guru Nanak was a complete Hindu. If he had maintained good relations with the Muslims and many Muslims became his disciples too, it was because of Sufism which those Muslims had adopted. This Sufism was nothing but what had directly been taken from Hindu scriptures and classics and their different interpretations which were outwardly clothed as Islam."

H.B. Hudson has said in 'The Great Divide' (page 10):

> "Sikhism is only a different form of Hinduism."

Even before the birth of Arya Samaj, the foundations for two different sects among Sikhs had been laid, and their main object was to create among the Sikhs a feeling of separateness from the Hindus. It should be remembered that from the time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh himself, in addition to acquisition of power, the Sikhs had started being drawn towards Hinduism. It was then that Dayaldas (1783–1855) started the *Nirankari* movement whose aim was to save the Sikh traditions from the influence of Hindu customs and rites. They themselves had neither tasted *"Amrit"* nor sported long hair or beard. They wanted in fact to practise and preach that Sikhism which had been prevalent before Guru Gobind Singh. Their main opposition related to idol worship at a time when the Sikhs had started erecting statues of the Gurus. They were of the view that the worship of any kind of idol or image was irreligious. According to them even Nanak was *'Nirankari'* or formless.

Likewise, the *Namdhari* sect too had been established before the advent of Arya Samaj. They also wanted to remove the orthodoxy or obscurantism that had crept in among the Sikhs. The founder of the *Namdhari* sect was Bhagat Jawahar Mal who was popular as Sai Sahib. He died in 1862. But while *Nirankaris* confined their activities to religious affairs, the *Namdharis* evinced interest in the political field also. Their sacrificers for cow-protection and acts of patriotism have been mentioned in Chapter seven. It should be noted that the Singh

Sabha did not like either of these two developments. It was not interested in either removing social ills prevailing among the Sikhs or in cow protection and patriotism. Their only ideal was loyalty to the British. Therefore, this group opposed the *Nirankaris* and *Namdharis* alike. Indeed, the latter day terrorism, encouraged by Bhindranwale, had begun with opposition to *Nirankaris*. And, gradually this terrorism went on developing until it became anti-Hindu, then anti-national and finally anti-humanity (the Kanishka disaster is an example).

Arya Samaj and Nationalism

Thus what has been said above is perhaps enough to indicate the course of Sikh history before the arrival of Swami Dayanand on the scene. There was a current of separatism as there was one of loyalty to the British. The British drew both these currents towards themselves after 1857. Among Arya Samajis themselves there were small groups favouring loyalty to the British. But they were unable to dominate the Arya Samaj mainstream. The general mass of Arya Samaj followers was always nationalistic in outlook and intensely patriotic. If Arya Samaj had attached importance only to Vedas, it would have remained a Vedic communal sect. But Swami Dayanand was as great a Vedist as he was a nationalist. During that period many other reformist organisations were born, such as Brahmo Samaj, Prarthana Samaj, Deva Samaj and the Theosophical Society. But they failed to be so popular among the masses as Arya Samaj because the content of nationalism in their creed was inadequate. Arya Samaj always stressed the importance of Vedas and Nationalism in an equal measure.

Looking at Swami Dayanand's thinking from the nationalist viewpoint, it becomes clear that he aimed at the unity of all communities.

By adopting Vedas, he wished religious unity for all sects. Although his mother tongue was not Hindi, he adopted this language as his own and made efforts to unite this multi-lingual nation and mould different communities proferring different religious faiths into one nation—to make it one *Aryavarta*. He instilled the ethos of national pride into the masses. As a pioneer among pioneers, who gave the slogan of '*Swaraj* is my birthright', 'self-government is better than the best of foreign governments', 'Our religion', 'Our culture', 'Our motherland', 'Our heritage', 'Our habits', 'Our ancestors' etc., he was incomparable. Swami Dayanand could thus never become loyal to the British. And British rule could never accept him. Indeed, the popular belief is that his death by poisoning was the result of a British plot.

Nationalism or patriotism is ingrained in every Arya Samaji. Consequently, he reacts very strongly against any anti-national act. And, that is why *Akali* leaders say that their demands are opposed neither by the Christians nor by the Muslims or the average Hindu but only by Arya Samajists. As far as thinking is concerned, Arya Samajis are no less extremists. But there is a world of difference between their extremism and that of the *Akalis*. The aggressive attitude of the *Akalis* is prompted by their narrow sectarianism; that of Arya Samajis is prompted by nationalism; by the interests of one united India. For the fulfilment of their demands the *Akalis* take recourse to violence or murder. The Arya Samajis are always ready for the supreme sacrifice in the interests of the nation, for the defence of the country. That is why where the hands of *Akalis* and other self-seeking opportunists are smeared with blood, the Arya Samajis have shed their own blood for noble causes. Arya Samaj has never produced murderers, it has always produced martyrs.

It was the staunch nationalism of Arya Samaj which had impressed the Sikhs in the 19th century, as a result of which there was amity between them. And it was this amity which had prompted the famous American scholar, Kenneth Jones to describe this period as one of "*Hindu-Sikh bhai Bhai*".

Apart from nationalism, there were other similarities which drew the Sikhs towards Arya Samaj. These in brief, could be described thus:

1. The founder of Arya Samaj had based its principles on the Vedas. It is to be noted that while the Sanatinists supported such practices as "*shradh*" of dead people, *Sati*, untouchability, keeping the womenfolk uneducated, child marriage, marriage of old people and sacrifice of animals at "*yagnas*" in the name of the Vedas, Swami Dayanand opposed these practices by invoking the same Vedas. He treated the Vedas as the base of all knowledge. Indeed the Vedas have frequently been quoted in Guru Granth Sahib also. In his "History of Guru Granth Sahib", the Dean of Religious Studies in Punjab University, and head of the department of Adi-Granth in Punjabi University of Patiala. Dr Taran Singh has said in his book 'Sri Guru Granth Salibda Salutik Khas' (Page 31):

> "Vedas have been mentioned 330 times in the Granth Sahib. Without the knowledge of the Vedas, which are our traditional base, one cannot understand Guru Granth Sahib. Its roots are in the Vedas. The Vedas are the principal source of complete knowledge. Just as the lighting of a lamp leads to the dispelling of darkness, a study of the Vedas also removes all ills ... only the proper knowledge of Indian spritualism can enable a person

to understand Sri Guru Granth Sahib without this it is difficult to understand the mystic naunces of this great book."

2. Another similarity lay in his strong criticism of religious obscurantism. At the *Kumbha Mela* in Hardwar in 1867, Swami Dayanand had exploded the base of hypocrisy by preaching for the abolition of idol worship and Puranic evil practices. There is an episode in Guru Nanak's life also associated with Hardwar. When he saw the devotees offering the holy water to the Sun after their bath in the Ganges, he himself started offering water in the opposite direction. When people asked him the significance of this strange act, he said he was irrigating his farms. The people asked him: "How can water from this place irrigate your farmland?" The Guru replied: "When the water offered by you can reach the Sun, crores of miles away, why can't the water offered by me irrigate the fields of Kartarpur, a few hundred miles away."

3. The third similarity pertained to social reform. In those days the social ills prevailing among Hindus and Sikhs were similar—such as child marriage, ban on widow remarriage, casteism, untouchability, etc. It was necessary to remove these evils to make society better and strong. There were Western-educated people in both Hindu and Sikh societies. They thought alike on this subject and considered all these evils as fatal for society.

4. A fourth similarity lay in the danger to the Hindus and Sikhs alike from Christianity. And, leaders of both the communities were alert and ready to remove this threat.

Sikh Co-operation

For the above reasons, the Sikhs gave sincere co-operation to Swami Dayanand when he first visited Punjab in 1877. Rather the credit for inviting Swami Dayanand to Punjab goes to the Sikhs themselves. Sardar Vikram Singh of Jalandhar had heard Swamiji's discourse for the first time in 1874–75 in Bombay. Thereafter he met Swamiji at the Delhi Durbar, and invited him to visit Punjab. The Maharaja of Kapurthala was also a great admirer of Swamiji.

When Swamiji visited Ludhiana on 31 March 1877, he stayed with the most prominent Sikh leader there, Sardar Jayamal Singh. He gave his discourses at the residence of this Sikh leader for 28 days. From there when he went to Lahore, Swamiji stayed with the prominent Muslim leader, Rahim Khan. When the Anarkali branch of Arya Samaj was established on June 24, its first secretary was Bhai Jawahar Singh who succeeded in enlisting 300 members to Arya Samaj. It was at his

instance that many Sikhs like Bhai Ditt Singh Giani, Bhai Maya Singh and Bhagat Laxman Singh etc. joined the Arya Samaj.

On 5 July 1877 when Swamiji reached Amritsar, famous social reformer of Punjab and founder of the 'Tribune' newspaper, Dayal Singh Majithia, accorded him a warm welcome and arranged for his stay at his own bungalow. Swamiji wrote the book 'Aryoddeshya Ratnamala' which contains a gist of his views during his stay there. With the efforts of Majithia, a house was hired for Rs 40 where Arya Samaj was established ceremonially. Its first secretary was advocate Bawa Narayan Singh. After this when Swamiji went to Jalandhar, he stayed at the house of Sardar Surjit Singh and gave discourses at the house of Sardar Surjit Singh and Sardar Vikram Singh. The present Arya Kanya Pathshala is functioning on the land donated by Vikram Singh. When Swamiji went to Ferozepur, he stayed at the bungalow of Sikh leader Sardar Sarup Singh. When on 4 April 1878 Arya Samaj was established in Multan, its first chairman was Sardar Prem Singh. When Swamiji went to Amritsar again, he stayed in the gardens of Sardar Bhagwan Singh. The famous industrialist of Amritsar Sardar Amar Singh had a massive building constructed on two acres land on Manzil Road and a Dayanand Arabi-Sanskrit Vidyalaya was set up there. It prepared many preachers with knowledge of both Arabic and Sanskrit who helped to make Punjab a citadel of Arya Samaj. It needs to be mentioned here that the grandson of Maharaja Ranjit Singh donated land in Wazirabad for Arya Samaj.

When Swamiji began the cow-protection campaign and prepared a memorandum for the British Government with signature of lakhs of people, the Sikhs came forward to take part in it in a big way. Swamiji himself praised Sardar Sarup Singh for his services to the Vedic *dharma*. With the encouragement of Swamiji, Anarkali Arya Samaj Secretary Bhai Jawahar Singh learnt Hindi and corresponded later with Swamiji in Hindi only. *Namdhari* Sikh leader Sardar Indra Singh gave big support to Swamiji's campaign for cow-protection.

Similarly when Arya Samaj started the *Shuddhi* campaign and thousands in Agra and Mathura rejoined the religion of their forefathers, the Muslim leaders were very upset. Then Akali leader Sardar Lal Singh, who was the secreatary of the Punjab Khalsa Sabha, declared:

> "The Muslims are over-reacting to the *Shuddhi* campaign. All Sikhs support this campaign and if the Muslims took to some untoward reaction, the Sikhs would be in the forefront to give a fitting reply."

When in 1939 Arya Samaj started an agitation for civil and religi-

ous rights in Nizam's Hyderabad, then the Sikhs co-operated in it fully. Even the Nankana Sahib Gurdwara Committee sent a *jatha*. Sardar Harbhajan Singh of Sant Nagar toured widely to collect volunteers for the *satyagraha*. The Lahore *jatha* was led by the revolutionary Sikh leader Sardar Man Singh Gama. All this was justified in the following saying of tenth Guru Gobind Singh:

जो तुम सिख हमारे आरज । देवो सीस धरम के कारज ।।
तृतीय जो नर नारी आरज । हो रहे निज धर्मों खारज ।।
पाप कुकर्मन में अति लागे । इसी हेतु हो रहे अभागे ।।

पंथ प्रकाश

"If you are true Arya Sikhs then it is your duty to give your head for the sake of the *dharma*. Those Arya men and women are unfortunate who give up Veda *dharma* and take to sinful activities."

होवे जाते यज्ञ पूजा बढ़े वैदिक रीत ।
होवे जाते देश आरज वैदिक धर्म प्रतीत ।।

"I want to do *yagna* to bring them round so that Vedic ways are revived, the country again becomes '*Arya*'".

The 'Arya Patrika' which started in Lahore in June 1885, had as its first editor Sardar Arjun Singh, who was the grandfather of Shaheed Bhagat Singh. He even wrote some books on the principles of Vedic *dharma*. The first significant biography of Swami Dayanand in English was written by Sardar Chajju Singh. He wrote 'Life and Teachings' of Swami Dayanand in 1903 which is even today considered an authentic work.

According to Lala Lajpat Rai's diary, the father of Sardar Bhagat Singh was the manager of Arya Orphanage in Lahore and his sons were educated in D.A.V. schools in an Arya Samaji atmosphere. Bhagat Singh and other revolutionaries fired their bullets at the notorious Saunders of the Simon Commission, (who had rained *lathis* at Lala Lajpat Rai) from near the gate of D.A.V. College, Lahore.

Arya Samaj Co-operation

The *Akali* leaders may keep blaming the Arya Samaj for the present Hindu-Sikh rift, but the Arya leaders have always supported their just agitations. When the Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee started an agitation to free the gurdwaras from the control of the corrupt

Mahants, then the law and the British Government supported them because these had become their personal property. The *Akalis* started occupying these gurdwaras through non-violent *satyagraha*. The British Government let loose atrocities on these *satyagrahis*. When the *Akalis* cut wood for the *langar* from the garden adjoining Guru Ka Bagh Gurdwara in Ajnala (Amritsar district), a case was filed against them and they were punished. The *Akalis* started a *satyagraha* over this issue and appealed for support to all the organisations of the country. Many Congress leaders, and Hindu leaders like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, supported this appeal. But the most active was Swami Shradhanand. In response to this appeal he himself reached Amritsar and in his address at the Golden Temple declared that this was not a struggle merely of the Sikhs but that of all Indians. He was arrested during the *satyagraha* alongwith the Sikhs and the magistrate sentenced him for one-and-a-half years. He remained in the Amritsar and Mianwali jails. The account of his jail term he has written in his book in Hindi called 'बंदी घर के विचित्र अनुभव' (Strange experiences in jail). This book reveals that whenever there was a Sikh congregation inside jail, they used to come to him for blessings. Under his leadership Guru Nanak birthday was celebrated in jail in the month of November and that of Guru Gobind Singh on 25 December 1922. (Swamiji had given the epithet of Rajarshi to Guru Gobind Singh). After release from jail Swamiji went to Amritsar where a great welcome was accorded to him by the Sikhs. At their insistence he was taken straight from the station to the Golden Temple where he was asked to address the congregation from the Akal Takht.

In 1935 the confrontation in Punjab over gurdwara Shahid Ganj shook the entire Sikh society. This case remained pending in the Lahore High Court for a Long time and later went up to the privy council. Famous barrister Dewan Badridas, who was the chairman of the Arya Pratinidhi Sabha Punjab for a long time, fought the case on behalf of the Sikhs with such force and ability that in the end the English judge had to decide the case in favour of the Sikhs. To celebrate this victory, Rai Bahadur Badridas was invited to the Golden Temple and given a tremendous reception. He was also honoured with a *saropa*. When the Sikhs tried to present him with a fee of Rs 30,000, he refused it, saying:

> "I have only done my duty in helping to return to our community the memorial of our ancient martyrs. How can one accept fees for this?"

The Rift

The question is, if there was so much amity between the Sikhs and Arya Samajis, then what caused the rift?

We have mentioned above the two separate waves that were current before the formation of Arya Samaj. As the co-operation between the Arya Samaj and the Sikhs increased, the said two currents of Sikhism began to weaken before this national mainstream. How could British imperialism tolerate this? They took recourse again to their "divide and rule" policy and they started furthering the game they had started playing after 1857. They made great efforts to win over the loyality of both the Sikhs and the Arya Samajis. Their tricks failed to win over the Arya Samajis. Then they turned their attention to the Sikhs. Here they found the black sheep because separatist movements were already on among them.

When in 1899 the Land Alienation Act was passed, the tax rise on canal water affected the educated urban Hindus of Punjab and introduction of stiff laws in new canal settlements turned the village Sikhs against the administration. Punjab echoed to the patriotic agitation of *'Pagri Sambhal Jatta'* (Save your turban, O Jat') The leaders of this agitation were Lala Lajpat Rai and Sardar Ajit Singh, an uncle of Bhagat Singh. The British Government sentenced them to exile.

To crush this agitation, the British prepared a section of loyal Sikhs and provided special protection and facilities to Sikh religious institutions which supported the British empire. A significant role was played in this by the Chief Khalsa Dewan. While loyalty for the British began to increase among Sikhs, the Arya Samajis were declared rebellions. That the nationalism of Arya Samajis was worrying the British is obvious from the number of cases of treason filed against them at several places. Finding almost all the leaders of Arya Samaj connected in some way or the other with the revolutionaries, the British Government even thought of banning the Arya Samaj. But such steps would have only increased the rebellion among the masses against the Government. The number of registered Arya Samajis may not have been very large, but their influence on the urban intellectuals and the village folks was much greater than their number. That is why the Government gave up the idea of banning the Arya Samaj. The elder son of Swami Shradhanand, Harish Chandra, went abroad with the famous revolutionary Raja Mahendra Pratap and disappeared from there. Balraj (son of DAV movement founder Mahatma Hansraj),

Ranvir (son of College Party leader Lala Khushal Chand Khursand) and Virendra (son of Gurukul Party leader Mahashaya Krishna) were charged with taking part in the Delhi and Lahore Conspiracy Case and sentenced to 10 years' rigorous imprisonment each. In such a situation it was not unnatural for the British to consider the Arya Samaj a rebellious organisation.

It was also a testing time for the Arya Samajis. When a case of treason was started against the Arya Samajis in Patiala, they were expelled from Patiala State proving that they had earned the ire of Patiala King as well. Nabha King Hira Singh was an admirer of the Arya Samaj work of social reform but he could not tolerate their anti-British propaganda. Perhaps he was under the influence of Macauliffe's imaginary forecast which had guaranteed a prosperous future for the Sikhs in co-operation with the British. Therefore he would not admit any Arya Samaj preacher into his State lest they provoke the masses against the British Government. To prove themselves more loyal than the British-area Sikhs, these Sikh-ruled States fanned the spirit of separatism planted by the British Government. The author of 'We are not Hindus' Sardar Kahan Singh had been the tutor of Nabha King Ripudaman Singh and till the end of his life was receiving financial help from the State.

After the arrest of Lala Lajpat Rai, in order to escape the ire of the British, many timid Arya Samaji Government servants had their names removed from Arya Samaj registers and broke with it. Being an Arya Samaji was enough to be harassed by the police. Some people even demanded expulsion of Lala Lajpat Rai from the Arya Samaj. But at this time Swami Shradhanand revived their morale. He invited leading pillars of the British rule like Ramsay Macdonald, Lord Chelmsford the viceroy and Sir James Meston and India-lovers like Dinbandhu C.F. Andrews to the Gurukul Kangri Vishwa-vidyalaya and thus stall the British anger against Arya Samajis.

The British tried to win over both the Arya Samajis and the Sikhs. The Sikhs were taken in but not the Arya Samajis. Still the nationalists among the Sikhs and the Arya Samajis maintained cordial relations. The arrest of Sardar Ajit Singh along with Lala Lajpat Rai is a case in point. It can be said that the Sikhs who remained in touch with the Arya Samaj could not be shaken from nationalism. The others were involuntarily swept away in the wave of British loyalty and communalism. It is not fair to blame the Arya Samaj for their flowing and murging in this current.

It was because of this separatist feeling that in 1905 idols of Hindu

gods and goddesses were removed from the Golden Temple. The intention of the Golden Temple founders is clear from the fact that they did not call it a gurdwara but a temple—Golden Temple and Hari mandir (temple). But the separatists could not tolerate this. The Hindus then made a separate Durgyana Mandir which was considered a rival of the Akal Takht. With the efforts of Nabha King Ripudaman Singh, the British Government passed an Anand Marriage Act in 1909. This was an important step in separating the two communities. Before this the Sikh marriages were also performed in the Hindu way.

An economic issue for separatism was also prepared. The founder of 'Tribune', Sardar Dayal Singh Majithia, was a famous nobleman. He had set up the 'Tribune' to propagate his liberal and reformist views. He had no children. Shortly before his death, according to the Hindu Succession Act, he left some property in the name of his wife and formed a trust with the rest to carry on his social work. In September 1893, after his death, his wife and other relatives took the will to court objecting strongly to its provisions. The relatives argued that he was a Sikh and not a Hindu and thus he did not have the right to offer his property to a trust according to the Hindu Act. The will was challenged in the High Court. The court deliberated over the issue whether the Sikhs are Hindus or not. Ultimately, the court ruled that Sardar Majithia was a Hindu. This judgement provoked a great debate in the Sikh society and it was a major issue in the newspapers of that time.

Arya Samaj member Jagat Singh wrote in his book 'Risala Prakash' in those days that in the sixteenth century, Guru Nanak freed Hindu *dharma* from its evil customs. The same task now the Arya Samaj is doing after hundreds of years. Amritsar's Bawa Narayan Singh and Lala Thakur Das wrote a book called 'Sikhs are Hindus'. From the other side Sardar Kahan Singh wrote a book 'We are not Hindus' to prove the Sikhs were different from Hindus.

Two Main Allegations

Two main allegations are laid at the door of Arya Samaj for the present state in Punjab. The first that Swami Dayanand had criticised Sikhism in his 'Satyarth Prakash' and second that the Arya Samajis, although speaking Punjabi at home, declared Hindi as their mother tongue in the census. A reply to both these allegations is necessary.

The first edition of 'Satyartha Prakash' was published in 1875. In the beginning when the Sikhs joined the Arya Samaj, they took no objection to the criticism whereas the Jains filed a case against Swami

Dayanand in 1882 for having criticised the Jain *dharma,* thus hurting their religious sentiments. There was no such complaint from the Sikhs. But when with British instigation, a separatist feeling was generated among the Sikhs, they started objecting to it. Guru Nanak also criticised the *yogis* of Kailash-Mansarovar and the external rituals of the *Pandas* of Hardwar and Jagannath Puri. Even otherwise, when a new *Acharya* comes, he criticises the previous *Acharyas.* If he doesn't do so, how can he establish his new creed? The kind of miracles claimed for Nanak in books like 'Suraj Prakash' and 'Nanak Chandrodaya' cannot be believed even by any impartial Sikh intellectual. How could a logician like Swami Dayanand accept it? Swamiji praised Guru Nanak and Guru Gobind Singh for protecting the Hindu nation during their time. He has even favoured the 'Panch Kakars', but only for the purposes of war. He did not approve of it as a part of daily life and religion. He considered bowing before the Guru Granth Sahib, making offerings and taking vows as another form of idol worship.

Everybody knows that Guru Nanak did not know Sanskrit. But nobody has tried to find out what is written in those Vedas which are refered to so often in the Guru Granth Sahib. Swami Dayanand himself did this work. Therefore every Veda lover, including Sikhs, should be grateful to him.

It is relevant to quote from Swami Shradhanand's book "Life of Arya Pathik Pt Lekhram" (page 98, 99) written about 70 years ago:

> "Once while travelling by train he happened to be in the company of an *Udasi Sadhu.* During the discussion, the *Sadhu* accused Swami Dayanand of being critical of *Sadhus* and said: "Dayanand has in his writing called Guru Nanak arrogant. This does not behove a *sanyasi.*" Pandit Lekhram started to explain to that *Udasi Sadhu* with great affection:, "Look, Swamiji has repeatedly praised the intention of Guru Nanak. Yes, at times his criticism of the Vedas he could not tolerate and finding him doing so without ever having read Sanskrit, he called it arrogance." Pandit Lekhram tried very hard but that *Sadhu* was not willing to understand. Instead he started making a great deal of noise. Then Pandit Lekhram shouted at the top of his voice, "What if I show you how Baba Nanak has himself said that he was arrogant?" The *Udasi Sadhu* was stunned at this. Pandit Lekhram read a couplet from the *Granth* of the Sikhs in which, alongwith a couple of other weaknesses, the word denoting arrogance was also mentioned. At this the Udasi Baba was floored

and said, "This is his humility. It does not actually mean that he was arrogant."

Ready-witted Pandit Lekhram then recounted the names of ten hated sins and asked, "Why hasn't Guru Nanak confessed to these sins? Guru Nanak was a true man and also a devotee of God. He did not mention the shortcomings which I attended to because he did not have them. He had only two or three weaknesses to get rid of which he used to pray to the Lord. You may consider your Guru whatever you may like but we consider him a lover of truth and devotee of God."

The *Udasi* again wanted to say something but the '*Arya Pathik*' put in the last word saying, "That's all, sir, I consider it a sin to talk to you. You are a Guru caluminator." After this the *Udasi's* lips were sealed."

Rishi Dayanand has given the following excerpt in 'Satyarth Prakash':

वेद पढ़त ब्रह्मा मरे चारों वेद कहानी ।
सन्त की महिमा वेद न जानी ॥
नानक ब्रह्म ज्ञानी आप परमेश्वर ॥

The second major charge is that this excerpt is found nowhere in Guru Granth Sahib. If this excerpt is not there, then the criticism is also useless.

It is correct to say that the relevant quote does not occur in Guru Granth Sahib, but Swami Dayanand had not read Gurmukhi nor had he studied Guru Granth Sahib. Whatever he was told he took down and incorporated in Satyarth Prakash. Maybe this couplet was not there in Granth Sahib, but being so very popular it reached Swamiji and because to this he did not find it necessary to check its authenticity. It usually happens. There is another couplet which is though popular but not found in Granth Sahib. That is —

करे करावे आपे आप ।
मानुष के कुछ नाहीं हाथ ॥

Secondly, the said excerpt is not there in the Granth Sahib in the order described, but there are synonymous words indicating that meaning. This occurs in two parts. The similar meaning is indicating in the following two couplets:

(क) नाभि कमल ते ब्रह्मा उपजे वेद पड़हि मुखि कंठ सवार ।
ताको अन्त न जाई लखणा, आवत जात रहे गुवार ।।

– गुजरी महला १, शबद २

(ख) सनक सनंदन अन्त नहि पाइआ ।
वेद पड़े पड़ि ब्रह्मा जनम गवाइआ ।।

– राग आसा कबीर, शबद १०

'वेद पढ़त ब्रह्मा मरे', and 'वेद पड़े पड़ि ब्रह्म जनम गवाइआ' 'आवत जात रहे गुवार are different in words but meaning is the same.

The second part is 'Charon Veda Kahani'. The same meaning is indicated by the following words:

वेद कतेब इफतरा भाई । दिल का फिकर न जाई ।।

– तिलग कबीर जी, शब्द १

In this couplet Vedas are called '*Iftara*'. *Iftara* means mere imagination (Gurmat Prabhakar p 648). Apart from this, Pt Tara Singh has said:

"इफतरा। अ.। बहुतान। बहकाव यथा-वेद कतेब इफतरा भाई."

"Sam Veda and other Vedas produce doubts with contradictory words. The doubts of the mind cannot be removed without a complete Guru" (Gurugirarth Kosh, pp 116)

Thus, while it is true that Satyartha Prakash couplets are not contained in Guru Granth Sahib, the meaning they signify can be obtained at several places.

At this some people say that if the relevant extract is not there in Guru Granth Sahib, then why isn't it omitted from the Satyartha Prakash?

The author of Satyartha Prakash was Swami Dayanand. If during his lifetime somebody had drawn his attention to it, then this lover of truth and discarder of the false would certainly have removed it. Only the author has the right to make changes in his writings. The author has been dead more than 100 years ago. Now no one else has the right to make such changes. What can be done is to provide a footnote below this extract saying that this couplet does not occur in Guru Granth Sahib in that form. Along with it the words that do describe such a meaning should also be put there.

Even then some people insist that since this portion does not figure in the Granth Sahib, it should be removed. The question then arises if somebody has written something, and that is not correct, then its removal should apply only to Satyartha Prakash or to every other

such books also? If this is to apply only to Satyartha Prakash, then it will be totally unfair. The following lines occur in Guru Granth Sahib itself:

गैंडा मारि होय जग कीए देवतियां की बाणे ॥

– राग मलार महला १, बार २५

"The nature of the Devas is such that they do havana by killing rhinoceros". *Brahmin Granthas* like Shatpath, Shrauta Sutras like Katyayan, mention *'Ajamedh'*, *"Ashvamedh"* and *"Gomedh"* but nowhere ever has any reference been found to *'Gaindamedh'* *yagna*. Should this reference therefore be removed from the Granth Sahib?

The second reference is about Hiranayaksha. Granth Sahib says—

दुरमति हिरणाखस दुराचारी
प्रभु नारायण गरब प्रहारी ।
प्रहलाद उधारे किरपाधारी ।

– गौड़ी अष्ट पदियां, महला १

हिरणाखस नखी विदारिया ।
प्रहलाद लीआ उबारि ॥

– राग भैरव, महला ३

In the description about *Avatars* in 'Dasham Granth', the story of Prahlad is given in detail. It says that God took *'Avatar'* as 'Narsingh' and killed Hiranyaksha and anointed Prahlad as the King. The story in its original shape figures in the Puranas. According to Bhagwat Purana, Prahlad's father was Hiranakashyap. Hiranayaksh was only his brother. The 'Narsingh' *Avatar* had killed Hiranakashyap and not Hiranayaksh. The version in Granth Sahib is therefore against the Puranas. If now somebody says that the *'Gainde maar'* and 'Hiranayaksh' version should be deleted from the Granth Sahib, will anybody be ready for it? When Ram Rai had changed the couplet "*Mitti Mussalman Ki Pere Pai Kumhar*" to "*Mitti Beiman Ki*" that is, he had substituted the word 'Beiman' for 'Mussalman', then Guru Har Rai had told him not to show his face again and also excluded him from the Guru lineage. When Guru Gobind Singh gave initiation to the *Khalsa*, he ordained that they refrain from *'Roti-Beti'* links or any other relationship with the Ramrais. One Bhai Mani Singh had not changed the excerpt in Granth Sahib, but only changed the sequence. He was accused of cutting of limbs of the Guru's body *(Gurudeh)* and

was punished by severence of his own limbs.

Even after these historical incidents, can one talk about change in the text of great books? If nobody has the right to make changes in the Granth Sahib, then how can anybody claim the right to change in Satyarth Prakash?

Why Hindi Alone?

Now, the accusation against Arya Samaj is that at its instigation all the Hindus of Punjab declared their mother tongue as Hindi in the 1951 census. It has to be answered in some detail because a great deal of bitterness has been created over this issue.

When Guru Teg Bahadur was asked to become a Muslim, then he had replied thus to Aurangzeb:

उत्र भण्यो धर्म हम हिन्दू । अति प्रिय को किम करे निकन्दू ॥
लोक परलोक उभय सुख दानी । आनन पाइयत याहि समानी ॥
मति मलीन मूरख मति जेई । इसको त्यागे पामर सोई ॥
हिन्दू धर्म रक्खे जग मांही । तुमरे करे विनसय यह नाहीं ॥

"My answer is that I am a Hindu and I love Hindu dharma. How can anybody destroy it? It provides happiness both in this world as well as in the other world. There is no other religion like it. Only a deranged person or a fool would leave it to become vile. Hindu *dharma* would remain in the world for ever. It is not going to be destroyed by your efforts." These words convey Guruji's unparalleled devotion to Hinduism. That is why he was called *'Hind ki Chadar'* (mantle of Hinduism or protecter of Hinduism). Those who call Sikhs as different from Hindus drill holes in this *'chadar'*. Like the Gurus' devotion to Hinduism, the Hindus also had great respect for the Gurus. The Gurus gave almost as much respect to Hindi as to Hindu *dharma*.

At that time the provincial dialects of Hindi that developed were known as Paschimi Hindi, Poorvi Hindi, Uttari Hindi and Dakhini Hindi. In Punjab it was known as Paschimi Hindi or Lahanda. Its script was known as Landa, Takra, Moondla or Mahajani. It was easy to write and was a kind of shorthand. It had one fault that it had no vowel marks. Much of it had to be understood by guesswork. A word like "Ajmer" could also be read as "Aj mare". To remove this shortcoming Guru Angad Dev evolved Gurmukhi as a mixture of Kashmir's Sharda script, Takra and Devnagari. The basis of the alphabet of Gurmukhi is the Sharda script. It has incorporated 19 letters of Sharda script in their original form. There was no Gurmukhi script before that

whereas the Devnagari script has a history of 1200 years. After this Gurmukhi was used only in Punjab and that also only in the religious literature of the Sikhs. Devnagari was however prevalent apart from Punjab, in all other provinces also. Before Guru Angad Dev all the writings and sayings of *Sants* and reformers were in Devnagari. This fact has even been accepted by Macauliffe in his 'Sikh Religion' (Second volume, pp55)

The very first book of Gurmukhi was the 'Janam Patri' (if it could be called a book) of Guru Nanak. In its original form it was in Hindi and Devnagari script. Guru Angad Dev had it converted into Gurmukhi script. Then also, the script had changed and not the language. The language continued to be Pashchimi Hindi.

What we call Punjabi today is only a wing of Hindi—Paschimi Hindi. If the Muslims had not given the Persian name of 'Punjab' to this area known variously in ancient times as Sapt Sindhu, Madradesh, Takkadesh, Valhik and Panchnad, then according to famous linguist Grierson, this language would even today have been called 'Lahenda' or 'Pashchimi Hindi'. But because of their communal feelings, the Sikhs linked Punjabi and Gurmukhi with their religion and put it up in confrontation with Hindi and Devnagari. No Hindu or Arya Samaji is opposed to Punjabi, which is in fact a dialect of Hindi. The Hindus of Punjab have as much affection for it as the Sikhs. When two Punjabis meet in India or outside India, they take pride in conversing in Punjabi only. This pride is the heritage of all punjabis. The controversy begins when Punjabi is tied up with Gurmukhi.

Till the time of Akbar, all the work was done in Hindi and Devnagari. Akbar's Minister Todarmal replaced it with Persian script. But even at that time Goswami Tulsidas raised the prestige of Hindi and Hindus by writing his Ramayana in Hindi. That tradition is continuing till today in Punjab. Even at the time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the language of administaration and courts was not Punjabi but Persian. The only literary output was 'Heer' by Waris Shah and it was written in Persian. This very Persian 'Heer' has been included as a textbook for examination in Punjabi. The Heer of Damodar is considered the original and proven one. This Damodar was the Patwari of Jhang-Sial and was closely related with Heer's father's family. In the marriage of Heer he had joined in feeding the *Baratis*. A Muslim has written about him:

दामोदर नामी खुशकलामी, हिन्दी ख्वानी, ताजा बयानी, दोहराबन्दी, शेरे बुलन्दी, रास्तगो, सफागो, साकन झंग सियाल, दर शेर हिन्दी साहिब कमाल, मुतरज्जम तरजमान, हर किस्म दास्तान ।(Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal Letters. Vol. XIX, 1953, pp 123)

In this Damodar has been called an expert at writing Hindi poetry and skilled in writing all kinds of stories. The meaning is also clear that what is called Punjabi today used to be called Hindi then and was written in Persian. This situation continued till the formation of Pakistan. The 'Puran Bhagat' of Kadar Yaar, 'Yusuf Julekha' of Maulvi Ghulam Rasool and 'Sohni Mahiwal' by other poets was written in Persian only. Shah Muhammad had written the historic account of the Sikh-British in Persian only. Even today the Punjabi Muslims of Pakistan use Persian as their script and not Gurmukhi. In the 16 districts of West Punjab, the Punjabi language is written in Persian script. Before the Partition, many Hindus and Sikhs used to read Japuji and Sukhmani in Persian. But now the Sikhs say that Punjabi is only what is written in Gurmukhi script! This way they have attached Punjabi, which was clear a dialect of Hindi, to Gurmukhi giving it a communal colour. Languages like Brajbhasha, Avadhi, Bundelkhandi, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Garhwali, Gorakhpuri, Bangru, Pahari and Dogri are all dialects of Hindi and are written in the Devnagari script. Leave alone the dialects, rich languages like Marathi and Nepali are also written in Devnagari script. But the Sikhs, because of their prejudice, have rejected Devnagari. This is the root of the problem. In 1931 Master Tara Singh himself had demanded freedom to write Punjabi in any script. It was being written only in Persian at that time. But today when the same demand is made by the Arya Samajis, they are not prepared to accept it. We repeat that the problem is not Punjabi—which is acceptable to all Punjabis—but what script it should be written in. The Sikhs say it should be written only in Gurmukhi. The Arya Samajis ask, "Why not in Devnagari also?" This question itself is a crime before Sikh communalism.

The same thing happens with Muslim communalism. Nobody is against Urdu. All scholars consider it a style of expressing Hindi. in early British period it was called जबाने हिन्दी But when the Muslims insist only on Persian script, then popular Indian opinion considers it sheer communalism. In the matter of political ambitions, as well as language and script, the Sikhs are following the footsteps of the Muslim League. Urdu and Punjabi are both Aryan languages of India. They have the full right to prosper in India, but not at the cost of Devnagari. The issue is not of language but that of script. Here also an imaginary fear is the cause of prejudice. The Muslims feel that if Persian script is not protected, then Urdu will cease to exist. The Sikhs feel that if Gurmukhi is not protected, then Punjabi will cease to exist. This is a false fear. Have Marathi and Nepali languages been destroyed by using the Devnagari script? Two excerpts will suffice to

show the importance of the Devnagari script:

> "The Sanskrit alphabet (Devnagari) of India and its system of apt sounds and pronunciation is so scientific, orderly and so superior to the alphabets prevalant all over the world that we can take pride over it as a miraculous invention of our forefathers."
>
> — Veer Savarkar
>
> "The Devnagari script is more important than the Hindi language. Nepali and Marathi language is also written in this script. Gujarati also uses this script (as in Baroda State). The Devnagari alphabet has been the alphabet of India right from the beginning. Devnagari script is the chief script of Sanskrit. Through the medium of Sanskrit, Devnagari may be said to be an international script. Wherever Sanskrit is studied, whether in London, Paris, Berlin, Tokyo, Afghanistan or Russia—they all have printing presses for Devnagari where Sanskrit books are published in a more beautiful and purer style than the one used in India." — Famous Oriental scholar and MP, Dr Raghuvir

The entire Hindi literature is directed to the masses. It is the literature of people's religion, people's sentiments and people's language. Because of this association of Hindi with the masses, the Gurus found it proper to encourage Hindi poets and to popularise Hindi poetry. They themselves adopted Brajbhasha as the vehicle of their views. The Gurus popularised in Punjab the *Bhakta* poets from the rest of India and encouraged their talented disciples to write poetry in Hindi. There were 52 Hindi poets in attendence of Guru Gobind Singh Ji. Prof Sant Singh Sekhon says about the language of Guru Granth Sahib: "Its language is a mixture of the ancient, the Sadhu language and Rajasthani-Brijbhasha".

Dr Trumpp and Cunningham openly admit that:

> "The chief importance of the Sikh Guru Granth lies in the linguistic line, as being the treasury of the Hindi dialects. (Preface, page VIII)
>
> "The language in which the whole work is written is not so much the old Punjabi dialect as the old Hindi. (History of Sikhs by J.D. Cunningham, 1894, page 346).

Dr Suniti Kumar Chatterji's statement in this connection is also worth noting:

> "The ancient corrupted form of Brajbhasha was very popular in Punjab but the poets of Punjab found Hindi or Hindustani more suitable. The religious poetry of the Sikh Gurus is an evidence of this. It is a mixture of Punjabi-Hindustani-Brijbhasha." (Indian

Aryan languages and Hindi, page 221)

The ex-vicechanceller of Delhi University and ex-speaker of Delhi Assembly Shri Gurumukh Nihal Singh is also worth quotable in this context. He says:

> "The language of the Adi Granth is described as Sant-Bhasa — which was used by medieval Indian saints throughout the country — although varying from region to region, being influnced by the regional language or the dialect. Thus we find in Adi Granth songs in various Indian languages. Besides Punjabi in its main forms, Eastern, Lehndi and Dakhni and Hindi — Eastern and Western, the Adi Granth contains some songs also in Marathi, Persian and a mixture of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhramsa called Sahaskriti."

Giani Gurmukh Singh writes about the 'Dasham Granth';

> वाणी दशम ग्रन्थ की भाई । आप रची कुछ गुर रचवाई ॥
> पर्व अठारह भारत करे । उपनिषदां पुराण बघरे ॥
> गोविन्द गीता सहित उपदेश । इत्यादिक पुस्तक सविशेष ॥
> संस्कृत ते हिन्दी भाषा । रचवाये गुरू रचे विलासा ॥
>
> पंथ प्रकाश

In this way, the Guru Granth is filled with Hindi and its dialects. Whose insistence is it to tie it up with Gurmukhi and not to recognise Devnagari script as Punjabi (Pashchimi Hindi). That of Sikhs or the Arya Samajis?

There is another reason for the Arya Samajis giving importance to Hindi and Devnagari. The administrative language of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar is Hindi, but the Muslims of that area declare their language as urdu even if they speak Awadhi, Maghadhi and Bhojpuri at home. The Hindus who speak same languages write their mother tongue as Hindi. The reason is the tradition in North India to write the language of their religious books as their mother tongue in the census. Just as it is natural for Muslims to write their mother tongue as Urdu because their religious books are in that language; in the same way it is natural for Hindus to write their mother tongue as Hindi because their scriptures are in Hindi.

There is another—a third—reason for writing Hindi as their mother tongue. Arya Samaj considers Hindi as a means of uniting India. The latest biographer of Swami Dayanand, Prof Jordens of the National University of Canberra, Australia, writes:

> "Wherever Swamiji went, from Benaras to Bombay and to Lahore, he made use of Hindi. For him Hindi was an agent to

triumph over the fissiparous tendencies of India. The unity of different provinces and races could be strengthened with it. Once he was asked when would India recapture its past glory and prosperity. His reply was that only when there is unity of religion, language and aims. It is clear from this that Swamiji considered the unity of language necessary for national unity."

From this point of view, Swamiji considered it necessary for everybody to study Hindi. Once somebody asked his permission to translate his books into Urdu. He replied with great affection:

"My eyes are thirsting to see the day when all Indians from Kashmir to kanyakumari would start speaking and understanding one language. Those who would really want to know my views, would consider it their duty to learn Arya Bhasha (Hindi)."

Not alone Swami Dayanand, all national leaders dreaming of the unity of India, even when they belonged to non-Hindi areas, have given special importance to Hindi. Swamiji himself was born a Gujarati. He was a scholar of Sanskrit, and he did not even know Hindi. Brahmo Samaj leader Keshab Chandra Sen drew his attention to the significance of Hindi in the national context. Thereafter he adopted Hindi and wrote all his books in Hindi only. Sharda Charan Mitra of Bengal had thought of one script for all Indian languages and towards this end, he brought out a journal called 'Devnagar'. The pioneer of cultural awareness in Bengal, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, had written:

"Only those can be honoured with the name of 'Bharatbandhu' who succeed in establishing unity between the different provinces of India through the use of Hindi. Let everybody make the effort, let it take as many days as possible, and the purpose will be fulfilled."

— (Bangadarshan, fifth volume)

Mahatma Gandhi was himself non-Hindi speaking but for the propagation of Hindi he formed a national language propagation committee (Rashtra Bhasha Prachar Samiti) and set up its branches in every province. He sent his own son (Devdas Gandhi) to Madras for Hindi propagation.

It was the result of the campaign of these very non-Hindi speaking national leaders that, after independence, Hindi was given the status of national and administrative language in our Constitution. Hindi is the chain which joins all the States of India. Hindi is the vehicle of our nationalism. If the Arya Samajis or Hindus of Punjab declare Hindi as their mother tongue, the reason is that they feel a sense of unity with

other States and consider Hindi to be the medium of expressing that unity. Hindi is not merely a language but a symbol of national pride. While it is the mother tongue of Punjabi Hindus, it is also the strong means of strengthening "*Bharat Takht*". The craze for Sikh domination plagues only those whose narrow vision can see only Akal Takht and not *Bharat Takht*. They see only Arya Samaj as a hurdle in the fulfilment of their crazy dream, that is why the ire against Arya Samaj.

In the matter of extreme views and their enforcement, the Arya Samaj does not lag behind. But Sikh extremism is for the expansion of their communalism, whereas Arya Samaj extremism is for spreading national unity. The Sikh pertinacity takes them towards terrorism, while the Arya Samaj persistence rouses them to self-sacrifice. There is an ego of the Sikhs and an ego of the Arya Samajis. There is only one way to avoid a clash of these two egos. Every community, every race, sub race or group must keep the nation above everything and must be ready to give their all for the sake of the nation. This is true nationalism. Every voice, not for the sake of the domination of a particular group or for a special status, but in the interest of the entire nation, should say:

इदं राष्ट्राय स्वाहा । इदं न मम ॥

Whatever, I have, I hereby offer it to the nation. All this is for the country and not for me.

If the Sikhs are the armour of Punjab, the Arya Samaj is its knowledge. If both these arms, carrying weapons and knowledge, devote themselves to national interest, then it can be said in the words of ShrimadBhagvad Gita:

यत्र योगेश्वरः कृष्णो यत्र पार्थो धनुर्धरः ।
तत्र श्री विजयो भूति र्ध्रुवा नीतिर्मतिर्मम ॥

"Where there is the knowledge of the crown of Yogis, Krishna, and the skill in weapons of Arjuna; the intellectual power as well as physical power *(Brahmbal* and *Kshatrabal)* have victory, prosperity and pleasure will be present. This is a permanent law."

May Punjab be blessed with both these powers, this is our hope and wish.